1 2 3	BIRNBERG & ASSOCIATES CORY A. BIRNBERG (SBN 105468) 703 Market Street Suite 600 San Francisco, California 94103 Telephone Number: (415) 398-1040 Facsimile Number: (415) 398-2001			
5	Barbara Norris (Ak. No. 8506070) LAW OFFICES OF BARBARA NORRIS			
6	645 W. Third Ave. Anchorage Alaska 99501			
7	Telephone Number: (907) 279-6621 Facsimile Number: (907) 279-0199			
8 9	Attorneys for Defendants Woodbine Alaska Fish Company, and Guy Ferrari Inc.			
10				
11	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
12	DISTRICT OF ALASKA			
13	CITICAPITAL COMMERCIAL CORP,)	Case No. A-04-0147 CI IN ADMIRALTY		
14	Plaintiff,			
15	v.)	DEFENDANTS AND CROSS-		
16	ECECIV SDIDIT official growth or 2000057	COMPLAINANTS' OBJECTION		
17	EGEGIK SPIRIT, official number 2999957,) her equipment, gear, furniture, apparel,	AND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF		
18	fixtures, tackle, boats, machinery, anchors) and all appurtenances, <u>in rem;</u>)	PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF		
19	NAKNEK SPIRIT, official number 585824, her equipment, gear, furniture, apparel,	TIME		
20	fixtures, tackle, boats, machinery, anchors and all appurtenances, in rem;			
21	WOODBINE ALASKA FISH CO., in personam; and GUY FERRARI, INC,			
22	<u>in personam</u> .			
23	Defendants,			
24)			
25				
26	Now come Defendants Woodhine Alas	ka Fish Company, Guy Ferrari, Inc and the		
27				
28	defendant vessels, Egegik Spirit and Naknek Spirit	rit, for themselves, and hereby object to		
40	/ 			

BIRNBERG & ASSOCIATES

703 MARKET STREET SUITE 600 SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94103 TEL (415) 398-1040 FAX (415) 398-2001

the Court's order granting Plaintiff's second motion for extension of time and requests reconsideration of the motion granting a second extension to Plaintiff, and allowing Plaintiff to object to the "final recommendations" (no objection was made to the initial recommendations). This was Plaintiff's 11th request for extension in this case from court deadlines.

NOTICE is further given that Defendants hereby move this Court for reconsideration on the grounds that Plaintiff motion was not filed pursuant to local rule 7.2(c) (shortened time) or on an *ex parte* basis and that **Defendants have a right to oppose** a motion before the Court rules on it.

This motion is based upon this notice of motion, the memorandum of points and authorities, and any other matter of which this Court wishes to take judicial notice.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF RECONSIDERATION

BACKGROUND

The deadline for filing any objections to the initial magistrate recommendations was February 15, 2006. Plaintiff filed none. The recommendation extended further time to file any response to an objection until the 23rd of February (additional time from the five days for a total of eight days, or three more days).

The only time period proscribed by Local Rule 12(C) for filing of objections and responses is after (1) the initial recommendations; (2) before the matter is transferred; and (3) as provided by the magistrate. It was therefore procedurally incorrect for Plaintiff to object to the final recommendation after it had been referred back to the judge, or otherwise, when the specific orders of the magistrate had not provided for it. This matter was referred to the Judge and was no longer appropriate for objection. This Court has

ASSOCIATES

3 MARKET STREET SUITE 600 SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94103 IEL (415) 398-1040 FAX (415) 398-2001

28

8

111213

10

1415

1617

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

BIRNBERG & ASSOCIATES 26

MARKET STREET

3 MARKET STREET SUITE 600 SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94103 TEL (415) 398-1040 "AX (415) 398-2001 already generously extended the amount of time provided by Local Rule 12(C) for responses to objections, allowing eight days, to February 23, 2006. This Court has also generously already granted Plaintiff an extension of time, giving Plaintiff exactly the amount of time Plaintiff requested. Now Plaintiff moves again for even more time in a motion, not filed on an *ex parte* basis, and this Court ruled on it without permitting an opposition.

ARGUMENT

Local Rule 7.1(e) **states:** "Unless otherwise ordered by the court, provided by statute, or rule, an opposition must be served and filed within fifteen (15) days of service of the motion, and replies within five (5) days of service of the opposition." Here the Court ruled on the motion within one day of its having been filed (two hours in reality), before Defendants had an opportunity to file the opposition they had already started. Procedural rules must be adhered to, and basic equity demands that both parties be heard on motions. Defendants wish this Court to reconsider its ruling and, at least, put *some* limitation on Plaintiff's ability to request extensions unilaterally, indefinitely, and without Defendants' right to be heard on the matter. From Defendants' standpoint, Plaintiff files a motion and its ruled on in two hours without even giving Defendant's a chance to reply. There was no motion to shorten time, or ex parte, and this is the second time the court has ruled without following motion rules and the 11th extension requested by Plaintiff. (The first motion to extend to object to the Final Recommendations was also ruled upon before the expiration of the motion time period. There is a very uneasy feeling in Defendants "camp" there is some unspoken bias toward defendants. There is no provision for objection to Final Recommendations, and the local rules are clear that motions have a discreet reply date.

8

ASSOCIATES

SUITE 600 SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94103 TEL (415) 398-1040 FAX (415) 398-2001

28

With respect to the underlying motion, Plaintiff argues that it inadvertently deleted the email noticing objections, casually glossing over the fact that it has two separate email addresses on the recipient list, (and if one was deleted why was not the other email and email account looked out. Plaintiff's original excuse that the email was inadvertently deleted just does not appear credible); and Plaintiff's argument is silent on why it did not go to the "recycle bin" to retrieve it, or check the court's docket as any prudent litigator would do when expecting something from opposing counsel, or verify with them that nothing had been filed once their deadline had passed. Given this highly contested case, it would seem naïve to not expect that something must be filed on the 23rd, the last day for a response.

Plaintiff agreed in its contract with the court to be bound by e-filing notice (Rule 5.3(2)(B)). This is *yet another* delay in the entire process, with *over eleven requests for* continuances and/or requests of counsel to stipulate to additional time prior to this by Plaintiff, at least one of which was requested after the deadline had passed. The subject motion for summary judgment was filed on *May 26, 2005*, and it is still ongoing ten months later. It is ironic that when Defendants' counsel had a medical emergency, and required an extension of time for the deposition of Joe Pitch, counsel for Plaintiff only gave him two days, and accused Defendants of unnecessary delay.

Defendants oppose further undue delay by Plaintiff's tardy pleadings, repetitive and numerous and increasingly incredible requests for extension of time, even requesting oral argument after it has already been denied by this Court. If Plaintiff's counsel is unable to meet now twelve separate deadlines throughout this matter without special accommodation by opposing counsel and/or this Court, Defendants respectfully submit that Plaintiff is not competent to represent his client in this matter.

	1	CONCLUSION			
	2	Defendants respectfully request that this Court maintain its Final			
	3	Recommendations and refer the matter back to the Judge, save and except the clerical			
	4	correction as to the sale amount of the vessel. In the alternative, should this Court grant			
	5	Plaintiff's motion, Defendants respectfully request that this Court put some limitation on			
	6				
	7	Plaintiff's ability to move for extensions of time for the remainder of the case and de			
	8	this matter indefinitely.			
	9	Dated: 14 March 2006	BIRNBERG & ASSOCIATES		
	10				
	11		By: <u>s/Cory Birnberg</u> Cory A. Birnberg		
	12		BIRNBERG & ASSOCIATES		
	13		CORY A. BIRNBERG 703 Market Street Suite 600		
	14		San Francisco, California 94103 Telephone Number: (415) 398-1040		
	15		Facsimile Number: (415) 398-2001 Email: <u>birnberg@birnberg.com</u>		
	16		California State Bar No. 105468		
	17		Attorneys for Defendants		
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21				
	22				
	23				
	24				
	25				
BIRNBERG & ASSOCIATES 703 MARKET STREET	26				
SUITE 600 SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94103 TEL (415) 398-1040 FAX (415) 398-2001	27				
. , , , , , , , , ,	28				
		1			